

UNITED STATES DISTRICT COURT  
CENTRAL DISTRICT OF CALIFORNIA

11 OMAR KING,

12 Plaintiff,

13 v.

14 L. KINGSLEY, *et al.*,

15 Defendants.

Case No. 2:22-cv-04484-FLA (BFM)

**ORDER ACCEPTING INTERIM  
REPORT AND  
RECOMMENDATION OF UNITED  
STATES MAGISTRATE JUDGE  
[DKT. 98]**

1 Pursuant to 28 U.S.C. § 636, the court has reviewed Defendant L. Kingsley’s  
2 (“Defendant”) Motion for Terminating Sanctions (Dkt. 85, “Motion”), the records and  
3 files herein, the Magistrate Judge’s Interim Report and Recommendation (Dkt. 98,  
4 “Interim Report”), and Defendant’s Objections to the Interim Report and  
5 Recommendation (Dkt. 101, “Objections”). The court has engaged in a *de novo*  
6 review of those portions of the Interim Report to which objections have been made.

7 The Interim Report recommends the denial of Defendant’s Motion, which seeks  
8 terminating sanctions based on Plaintiff’s failure to respond timely to certain  
9 discovery requests. Dkt. 98 (“R. & R.”). Defendant’s objections to the Interim  
10 Report do not merit any change to the Interim Report’s findings or recommendations.  
11 Defendant objects to the Interim Report’s characterization of the denied discovery  
12 evidence as marginal. Dkt. 101 (“Obj.”) at 2-3. The evidence is Plaintiff’s work  
13 schedule on the day of the alleged incident of excessive force, which allegedly  
14 included Defendant pepper spraying Plaintiff. R. & R. at 7. Defendant argues that, if  
15 “Plaintiff was not scheduled to work that day, that undercuts Plaintiff’s claims of  
16 malicious intent on the part of Defendant. And calls into question Plaintiff’s intent in  
17 approaching Defendant that day. Intent is central in this case, not marginal.” Obj. at  
18 3. This objection does not persuasively undercut the Interim Report’s finding that,  
19 even if Plaintiff “was wrong about what his schedule was,” what matters is whether  
20 Defendant “was justified in her use of force.” R. & R. at 7. The court agrees with the  
21 Interim Report that the work schedule is not so critical that Plaintiff’s failure to  
22 provide it warrants the severe sanction of termination of the action. *Id.*

23 Defendant objects that the sanction of exclusion is not sufficient. Obj. at 3-5.  
24 The court disagrees and concurs with the Interim Report’s finding that sanctions that  
25 are less drastic than a case-dispositive sanction remain available should Plaintiff  
26 produce the requested document later. R. & R. at 7. As the Interim Report correctly  
27 points out, Plaintiff can be precluded from using the work schedule to corroborate his  
28

1 account. *Id.* The court agrees with the Interim Report that sanctions less drastic than  
2 termination of the action remain available and could be warranted if appropriate.

3 The court ACCEPTS the recommendations of the Magistrate Judge and  
4 ORDERS as follows:

5 1. The Interim Report is ACCEPTED;  
6 2. Defendant's Motion is DENIED; and  
7 3. The Clerk of the Court shall SERVE this Order on all counsel or parties  
8 of record.

9  
10 IT IS SO ORDERED.

11  
12 Dated: July 29, 2025



---

13 FERNANDO L. AENLLE-ROCHA  
14 United States District Judge

15  
16  
17  
18  
19  
20  
21  
22  
23  
24  
25  
26  
27  
28